

Serial No.: 10/056,789
Art Unit: 2155

Attorney's Docket No.: VTX0160-US
Page 7

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawing includes a new Figure 7. This sheet, which includes Figure 7, is enclosed with this Amendment.

Attachment: A New Sheet of Drawing

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-13 were pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended for clarification. Accordingly, claims 1-13 will be remained pending herein upon entry of this Amendment, of which claims 1 and 10 are independent claims. The amendments have support in the specification at, for example, page 13, lines 12-19. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for failing to show the feature “without sending an acknowledge signal back to the transmitter” of the claims. Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,818,852 to Kapoor (“Kapoor”). Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kapoor in view of Admitted Prior Art (“APA”). To the extent these grounds of rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

In accordance with a telephone conversation with Examiner Duong on April 11, 2006, Applicant respectfully submits a new sheet of drawing, Figure 7, to overcome the objection of the drawings. The newly submitted Figure 7 is a flow chart showing a method for reliable unacknowledged communication of long length data messages in accordance with the recited claims. Figure 7 is prepared based on the original independent claim 1 and has support at least at

page 12, lines 9-12 and page 13, lines 1-2 and 12-19 of the specification. Therefore, no new matter has been introduced.

Amended claim 1 has defined more clearly the “unacknowledgement” features of the invention by reciting determining that the long length data message has been correctly received when the message integrity field value of the stored subpackets corresponds to the transmitted message integrity field without a need of sending back an acknowledge signal when the long length data is determined to be received correctly. Similarly, amended claim 10 recites that when the long length data packet is determined to be correctly received, the data within the correctly received long length data packet is subsequently processed by the receiver without sending an acknowledge signal back to the transmitter.

As described at page 13, lines 12-19, the present application divides a long length data message into a plurality of subpackets and a transmitter transmits the plurality of subpackets for a predetermined number of times even though the plurality of subpackets are received correctly at its first transmission or are still not received correctly after the predetermined number of transmissions. In this manner, a receiver is not required to send a retransmission request when the long length data message is not received correctly or an acknowledge request to inform the transmitter that the long length data message has been received correctly. That is, according to the invention, the receiver needs not to take any feedback actions whatsoever.

The transmitter of Kapoor, however, is requested to resent a long message after a predetermined timer is expired without receiving an acknowledge signal from a receiver. That is, Kapoor first transmits the long message once and waits for feedbacks from the receiver to

determine whether it needs to resend the long message again. In order to stop resending the long message, the transmitter has to receive a knowledge signal from the receiver within a predetermine period of time.

Accordingly, Kapoor fails to teach or suggest transmitting a plurality of subpackets and the message integrity field to at least one receiver over a communications link a predetermined number of times, as recited in amended claim 1 and similarly in amended claim 10. Moreover, Kapoor also fails to teach or suggest that determining that the long length data message has been correctly received when the message integrity field value of the stored subpackets corresponds to the transmitted message integrity field without a need of sending back an acknowledge signal when the long length data is determined to be received correctly, as recited in amended claim 1, and when the long length data packet is determined to be correctly received, the data within the correctly received long length data packet is subsequently processed by the receiver without sending an acknowledge signal back to the transmitter, as recited in amended claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated over Kapoor and the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, as the present application does not require retransmission requests or any kind of feedbacks from the receiver, the present application is capable of transmitting the long length data message to a plurality of receivers. On the contrary, as Kapoor requires the receiver to send back an acknowledge signal from the receiver, Kapoor would encounter difficulties when used in a one-to-multiple transmission (i.e., the plurality of subpackets are sent to a plurality of receiver.) For example, the transmitter of Kapoor has to recognize the origin of an received

acknowledge signal and to avoid from collision when a plurality of receivers send back acknowledge signals at the same time.

Due to the differences of concepts between the present application and Kapoor as mentioned above, it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to achieve the present invention by simply modifying Kapoor. There is no teaching in Kapoor that the transmitter transmits a plurality of subpackets to at least one receiver for a predetermined number of time and the receiver does not need to send an acknowledge signal back to the transmitter when it is determined that "the long length data is determined to be received correctly," as recited in amended claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, Applicant further respectfully submits that the 103(a) rejection of claims 1-8 should be also withdrawn.

To support his rejection of claims 10 and its dependent claims 11-13, the Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to achieve the invention by combining Kapoor and APA. However, in addition to the differences of APA from the present invention as described in the specification, APA also fails to teach or suggest the "unacknowledged" feature, as recited in amended claim 10. As described above, as Kapoor describes a different concept from the present application, it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Kapoor and APA to achieve the system of amended claim 10.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-13 should be patentable over Kapoor in view of APA.

Serial No.: 10/056,789
Art Unit: 2155

Attorney's Docket No.: VTX0160-US
Page 12


In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: April 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Poh C. Chua
Registration No. 44,615

MB/PCC/CYM/dkp

Encl.: New Sheet of Drawing, Figure 7

Customer No. 00909